14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

armament.[140] Thus the largest bodies were assembled, furnished with weapons, and organized under their respective leaders of all grades on very short notice, awaiting the signal from the chief commander to sally forth, either by canoes across the lake,[141] or along the causeways, to the mainland. Each warrior carried mostly his own frugal provisions[142] which the women of each household had prepared; "corn-bread, meal-cakes, ground beans, "corn-meal seasoned with pepper;"[143] but special carriers also accompanied the force, loaded with a surplus of food, with robes for tents, reeds for huts and bowers, and with cooking utensils like kettles, pans, baskets; also with mats.[144] Sometimes these

[140] It also happened that an interval of twenty days (a Mexican month) elapsed between the proclamation of war and the final departure. At least, in most cases, a few days were spent in preparations, since the Mexicans had to give time to their outside allies or subjects to prepare, also. Tezozomoc (Cap. XXXVI): "The Mexicans in "the interval prepared the arms in all the quarters,— shields, swords, and made and "finished many rods ('tlatzontectli'), also slings, and pebbles to be thrown with "cords." (Id., Cap. LVII) "Within twenty days they prepared and fitted out all kinds "of arms, first in the five quarters of Mexico-Tenuchtitlan: Moyotlan, Teopan, Ytza-"cualco, Cuepopan, and Tlatilulco, now called Santiago." In many cases, however, an instantaneous mobilization of the whole force became necessary. Mexico, in times of peace, had to be always ready for war. See, also, Tezozomoc (Cap. XXXII, pp. 49 and 50).

[141] Canoes, "acalli" (water-houses, from "atl," water, and "calli," house), were used for the traffic with the main land, but also largely for the carrying of warriors. It is well known what important part they played against the Spaniards during the siege. For the movements of the Mexicans against a hostile tribe, both on land and water, see Durán (Cap. XIV, p. 121), wherein he describes the attack upon Cuitlahuac, both by canoes and on dry land.

[142] Durán (Cap. XLVI, p. 369): "porque demas de lo que los reyes proueyan de sus "grandes trojes y graneros, cada soldado llevaua á questas su particular comida, "todo lo que podia llevar, atada á la carga el espada y la rodela, etc., etc."

[143] The women *prepared* the food, but it also occurred that the *stewards dispensed* it. Tezozomoc (Cap. XXXII, p. 49): "With this the stewards and calpixques of the tribes "gave to their quarters maize for to make biscuit, tlacactutopochtli, pinole, ground "pepper, chian, beans, and all what pertained to it, providing themselves with every-"thing necessary for certain day stated." The "tlaxcaltotopochtli" (from "tlaxcalli," corn-bread, and "totopochtli," burnt-bread) would be biscuit of maize-meal, and it is therefore called "viscocho." The pinolli, or pinole, corn-meal mixed with pepper, was an important victual. The food of the Mexicans, in general, outside of the meats (exclusively fowl and some game) and aquatic animals, consisted of maize in various forms, and of pepper, "chilli," as seasoning. Cacao furnished their main beverage, and stores of it were taken along. See, also, Durán (Cap. XLVI, p. 369: "maiz tostado "y otro molido y hecho harina, frijol molido, pan biscochado, tamales mohosos y cura-"dos al sol, grandes fardos de chile, cacao molido hecho en pellas"). They also used maize to compose a beverage called "yolatl," which possessed particularly vivifying qualities (See note of 8r. Ramirez to p. 290 of Durán), and which they dispensed even on the battlefield (Durán, Cap. XXXVII; Tezozomoc, Cap. LII).

[144] These carriers are called "tamemes," and are generally regarded as having been slaves. But they probably were outcasts from the bond of kinship, or the men of newly conquered tribes (like Tlatilulco for a time after its capture), upon whom this degrading work (*because woman-like!!*) was imposed as a penalty. Slaves were not nu-

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

connected, through stock-language or even dialect, with the Mexicans, but they were actually "kin of their own kin." Their punishment therefore was that of a crime committed against kinship and tribe. As we shall hereafter attempt to show, such delicts entailed death. Instead of exterminating a whole settlement however, the Mexicans treated the survivors as *outcasts from the bond of kinship*, degrading them to manual, therefore female labor.[58]

[58] The descriptions of the capture of Tlatilnico by the Mexicans, while "Face in the Water" (Axayacatl) was the latter's head war-chief, are so numerous, and in their features as far as the subject of this paper is concerned, so generally concordant, that I may be permitted to forego quotations. I simply refer to the best known authors on ancient Mexico in general. Still, these authors seem to report but the "Tenuchcan" side of the story. Although *Boturini* ("*Idea*" "*Catalogo del Museo Indiano*," p. 23), mentions the copy of "Un Mapa en papel Européo, donde estan pintados los Reyes de Tlatilaico, y de México" as the only specifically "Tlatilulcan" document of which he knows, there still is preserved to us a tale of the overthrow of the pueblo of Tlatilnico, which bears distinctly the stamp of a genuine Tlatilulcan version. We owe it to *Oviedo y Valdés* ("*Historia general y nat. de Indias*," Lib. XXXIII, cap. XLVI, pp. 504 and 505). "Avia dos parcialidades ó bandos en aquella república, la una se decia Mexicanos, é la otra Tlatebulcos, como se dice en Castilla Oneçinos i Gamboinos, ó Giles é Negretes. Y estos dos apellidos tenvieron grandes diferencias: é Monteçuma, como era mañoso, fingió grande amistad con el señor principal del bando Tlatebulco, que se decia por sus nombré proprio Samalce, é tomóle por yerno, é dióle una su hija, por le asegurar. Con este debdo, en cierta fiesta é convite á este Samalce, é á todos sus capitanes é parientes é hombres principales, hizolos embeodar: é desque estuvieron bien tomados del vino, hiçolos atar é sacrificarlos á todos, sacándoles los coraçones vivos, como lo tienen por costumbre. E los que padescieron esta crueldad passaban de mil hombres, señores principales; é tomóles las casas é quanto tenian, é poblólas de sus amigos é de los de la otra parçialidad Mexicana. E á todos los que tuvo por sospechosos, desterrólos de la ciudad, que fuéron mas de quatro mil hombres; y en los bienes é moradas destos hiço que viviessen los que el quiso enriquesar con bienes agenos. E aquellos que desterró, hiço que poblassen quatro leguas de alli, en un pueblo que de aquella gente se hiço, que se llama Mezquique, é que le sirvirssen de perpétuos esclavos. E assi como la cibdad se deçia, y es su proprio nombre Temistitan, se llamó é llama por muchos México dende aquella maldad cometida por Monteçuma." This story is repeated by him with less detail (Cap. I, p. 533). Although manifestly incorrect, it is still interesting to compare with the current version.

The punishment which the Tlatilulca received, is also mentioned by a number of authors. The prominent sources, however, are: *Durán* (Cap. XXXIV, pp. 270 and 271), *Tezozomoc* (Cap. XLVI, pp. 74 and 75). Both of these relate that, besides, the great market place of Tlatilulco about which the latter says: "that the tianguis (market) was esteemed beyond, as if they had gained five tribes." The Tlatilulca were, as we shall hereafter see, mostly traders and, as one of their old men is made to say to "Face in the Water," by *Tezozomoc* (p. 74): "We are traders, merchants, and will give you (follows a long list of articles promised) . . . . . since by force of arms this tianguis has been gained." *Durán*, (p. 270): "After this was done, the King commanded that this place and market which they had gained should be distributed among the lords, since the Tlatilulca had no other soil." Compare also the statements in regard to trading and bartering in aboriginal Mexico, and to the beginning of the traders at Tlatilnco, in *Sahagun* (Lib. IX. cap. I, pp. 335 and 336).

"Kin of their own kin." In regard to this statement I beg to refer to one made by *Veytia* (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 135): "Some modern national writers say that this separation did not occur precisely as between nobles and plebeyans, but that eight families